

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:17-cr-151(2)

JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.

v.

CINDY DAHDAH,

Defendant.

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Cindy Dahdah's Second Motion for Compassionate Release (ECF No. 175), Amended Motion for Compassionate Release (ECF No. 176), and Motion for Extension of Time to File a Reply (ECF No. 178). The Government opposes the motions for release (ECF No. 177). For the following reasons, the Amended Motion for Compassionate Release (ECF No. 176) is **DENIED** and Defendant's Second Motion for Compassionate Release (ECF No. 175) and Motion for Extension of Time to File (ECF No. 178) are **DENIED as moot**.

Defendant Dahdah is currently serving a 60-month sentence for one count of attempt and conspiracy to commit mail fraud, one count of health care fraud, and four counts of making false statements relating to healthcare matters. (ECF Nos. 86, 133.) She is scheduled for release on January 17, 2024. (ECF No. 167.) On May 26, 2020, Defendant Dahdah filed a Motion for Compassionate Release (ECF No. 167) stating that her medical conditions, her age, and the rate of Coronavirus infection at her facility created an extraordinary and compelling reason for her immediate release. The Court denied Defendant's motion and found that, in light of the Bureau of Prisons' ("BOP") efforts to stop the spread of COVID-19, there were no "extraordinary and

compelling reasons” justifying her release. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i). This Court further stated that Defendant presented insufficient evidence of her medical conditions, and even if she did suffer from the asserted conditions, the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) dissuaded the Court from granting compassionate release. (*See* ECF No. 172.)

On December 29, 2021, Defendant Dahdah filed an Amended Motion for Compassionate Release. She asserts again that compassionate release is warranted because of her declining health, the rate of Coronavirus infection at her BOP facility, and the arrival of the Delta variant at the BOP facility. (ECF No. 176.) Defendant does not present new evidence or arguments that warrant compassionate release. Additionally, because Defendant is fully vaccinated and already contracted COVID-19 since her first motion for compassionate release, she is at a lower risk of contracting it again.

For these reasons, and the reasons set forth in the Court’s prior Opinion and Order, Defendant’s Amended Motion for Compassionate Release is **DENIED** and the accompanying motions (ECF Nos. 175, 178) are **DENIED as moot**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

2/25/2022
DATE

s/Edmund A. Sargus, Jr.
EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE